



OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS
Hearings Division

DECISION

Phoebe Dossett, Esq. - Nacmias Law Firm, PLLC 592 Pacific Street 1st Floor Brooklyn, NY 11217	Summons No: 039126171L et al. (1 Summons) DEPT OF BUILDINGS, -against- SINGH, SAVITRE Hearing Date: 01/15/2026 Hearing Location: Remote Type of Hearing: By Telephone
--	--

Total Penalty Amount: **\$1,250.00**

Community Service(Hr): **Not Applicable**

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
039126171L	Sustained	09/30/2024	129-13 133 STREET Queens

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B201	28-105.1	Sustained	\$1,250.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

This remote hearing was conducted on January 15, 2026. Respondent (Savitre Singh) appeared by attorney, Phoebe Dossett. Henry Pita appeared for Petitioner (DOB).

Respondent was charged with a class-2 violation of 28-105.1. Work without a permit..." At front, created porch with awning and metal post approx.. 16 ft wide. At rear installed metal staircase leading to 2nd fl. Also, excavation work done to install entry door to cellar at rear."

Mr. Pita submitted Petitioner's evidence package including the I/O's photographs (3 pages) depicting the front

porch with awning supported by metal posts and the metal staircase at the rear. Mr. Pita also submitted Google Map images of the cited property from June 2018 and October 2024. In addition, he submitted Respondent's deed (Document Date: April 4, 2016). See: Pet. Ex. #1 and #2.

Mr. Pita noted the additional changes to the porch between 2018 and 2024 (after Respondent's ownership began in April 2016). Mr. Pita also noted that the two (2) vertical metal posts are support posts for the awning. A permit is required. In addition, Mr. Pita noted that, notwithstanding the posts for the awning, the front of the house (depicted in Google Maps over time) was substantially altered contrary to Respondent's affidavits.

Ms. Dossett asserted a pre-existing condition defense. She submitted Respondent's evidence package including two (2) handwritten, notarized statements from neighbors and a copy of Respondent's deed. See: Resp. Ex. A and B. She noted that the statements were handwritten and not written by her office. The statements were written by neighbors who had no relationship to Respondent. She also noted that the deed was an arms-length transaction.

In the first neighbor's sworn statement, he states that, "Respondent has never had construction done to their house. I been here since 2016." The second neighbor states, "Since the new owner bought this property, it's still the same way it was with the previous owner."

Based on the record before me, I credit the issuing officer's affirmation of the factual allegations. I find that Respondent fails to submit credible evidence to refute the factual allegations, nor does Respondent present persuasive evidence to establish the pre-existing condition defense. Specifically, I find that Petitioner's evidence clearly established that Respondent altered the front porch awning and installed the metal staircase in the rear-without obtaining the required permits.

I further note that, although Petitioner's evidence does not depict the cited excavation work (to install the cellar entry door), I find that this summons establishes a prima facie case that can be sustained based on the two (2) violating conditions supported by Petitioner's evidence (awning and rear staircase). Moreover, I find that Respondent's sworn statements, from two (2) neighbors, lack specificity and therefore are insufficient to establish the pre-existing condition defense. Accordingly, I sustain this summons.

J. Beck-Wall

01/25/2026

01/25/2026

Joan B Beck-Wall, Judicial Hearing Officer

Date